

## REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-10, and 12-18 are pending in the application and the same are rejected. Claims 1-3, 5-10, and 12-18 remain in the application and are presented for review and further consideration by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-10, and 12-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Franklin, et al., U.S. Published Application 2001/0023440, in view of Hancock, et al., U.S. Patent No.6,295,502. (Examiner's Action, page 2, ¶ 1). In particular, the Examiner suggests that Hancock teaches a GRL tag including at least a description of the physical location of the resource, the description of the physical location including a coordinate system and coordinates for the resource.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Hancock discloses storing location information in a data packet 1708. Figure 17 illustrates the contents of the data packet 1708. The location information includes coordinates and may be in the Go2 grid coordinate system format or a latitude/longitude coordinate system format. The coordinates being in one format or another does not imply or suggest that the coordinate system is also included with the coordinates. Hancock does not disclose the location information or the data packet 1708 containing a coordinate system. Furthermore, no data structure disclosed by Hancock contains both a coordinate system and coordinates. Therefore, Hancock does not disclose a description of a physical location including a coordinate system and coordinates for the resource.

In contrast, Applicant's independent claims 1, 8, and 15 include wording that a global resource locator (GRL) tag is assigned to a resource, the GRL tag includes at least a description of the physical location of the resource, and the description of the physical location including a coordinate system and coordinates for the resource. Neither Franklin nor Hancock discloses any structure that includes a coordinate system and coordinates for a resource.

In view of Applicant's arguments and amendments with respect to independent claims 1, 8, and 15 being allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that the remaining dependent claims are also allowable because they contain all of the limitations of their respective independent claims and further add structural and functional limitations.

The foregoing amendments and arguments are believed to be a complete response to the most recent Examiner's Action.


No new matter has been added.

It is respectfully submitted that there is no claim, teaching, motivation, or suggestion in any of the prior art cited, alone or in combination, to produce what Applicant claims.

It is further submitted that the application, as amended, defines patentable subject matter and that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Should any issues remain which would preclude the prompt disposition of this case, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,  
Charles E. Cantwell

By   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark G. Pannell  
Reg. No. 40,761

Date 04/08/2005  
(719) 260-7900